

THE  
NEGRO EXCLUSION:

A REPLY TO

MR. JOSEPH MALINS,

SHOWING HOW MR. MALINS AND THE LEADING SECESSIONISTS  
AIDED THE EXCLUSION AND HINDERED THE ADMISSION OF  
THE NEGROES INTO THE ORDER OF GOOD TEMPLARS.

BY WILLIAM HOYLE,

AUTHOR OF "OUR NATIONAL RESOURCES AND HOW THEY ARE WASTED,"  
"WASTE OF WEALTH, &c."

PRICE TWOPENCE.

LONDON: E. CURTICE & CO., CATHERINE STREET, STRAND.  
MANCHESTER: A. IRELAND & CO., PALL MALL.

—  
1877.

[THIRD EDITION.]

## P R E F A C E.

---

IN the following pages my aim has been to vindicate and more fully demonstrate the facts contained in my former pamphlet.

I have dwelt somewhat lengthily upon two points,—the foundation principles, and the history. These, especially the latter, I regard as the vital points in the controversy. If the British cannot show that, prior to their ultimatum, they made a reasonable and constitutional effort to correct the evils that existed, then their case is gone. I submit to the reader that I indisputably prove that they did not.

I have not referred at all to the remarks made by Mr. Malins upon Dr. Lees; the Doctor has recently dealt with them himself in his report. Nor have I noticed the sneering allusions to Dr. Oronhyatekha and others. Such references ought not to emanate from the head of an Order whose motto is "*Charity*."

There are many things woven into Mr. Malins's narrative which are entirely wide of the mark. I have passed over such. There are also a number of gibes and jokes, such as the references to the costermonger's donkey, the bacca, the barber, &c. These are not in my line, and I therefore leave them alone.

I have dwelt upon the latter part of Mr. Malins's reply very briefly; first of all, because it is not a reply to me. And secondly, if all be true that is there stated, it could not have influenced the secession, because it was found out afterwards. And thirdly, if evils existed anywhere, they ought to have been remedied in a constitutional manner. This was never attempted by Mr. Malins.

It has been with deep regret that I have found myself obliged to take the position I have done, but if I would be honest to my convictions, I felt that necessity was laid upon me.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I have no intention of taking any further part in this controversy, beyond what may be necessary to correct any misapprehensions which may arise, or give any explanation which may appear to be needful.

Claremont, Bury,  
April 26th, 1877.



301.451

H85n

1877

## THE NEGRO EXCLUSION.

---

AT last the reply of Mr. Malins has made its appearance, and, aided by the prompt attention of my friend, Mr. Hardy, of Birmingham, who has been on the look-out for me for the last three months, I have been enabled to get an early copy of Mr. Malins's tract. It came to hand just six days before the meeting of the Grand Lodge at Plymouth.

Two reasons are alleged for this delay. The first is, Mr. Malins's "*onerous and incessant duties*;" but this excuse will hardly bear examination, for if, as he boasted, he was prepared to reply to it in three days, surely he need not be 17 weeks in correcting it! His second excuse is, that he has been procuring documents from America to complete his chain of evidence—or, in other words, he hangs his man, and then tries him afterwards; and because he finds that he has not got evidence to justify the hangman's deed, he spends 17 weeks in hunting up all additional evidence that can be obtained to justify what he has done. All I have to say as to his conduct in this respect is, that it is more worthy of a Jeffries of the seventeenth century, than a Grand Worthy Chief Templar in an Order of Faith, Hope, and Charity, in the nineteenth.

I will not, however, occupy the reader's time by dwelling further upon this point. The reply at last is out, and my present duty is, to see how far it meets the indictments which I made against the conduct of Mr. Malins and his friends, from the Madison Session down to the passing of the famous Birmingham resolution, when, without trial or hearing, in the most unconstitutional and tyrannical manner, it was resolved by the secessionist leaders to cut off all those who would not follow them in their act of rebellion and secession.

Before entering upon a detailed exposure of the vagaries and errors of Mr. Malins's pamphlet, I desire at once, and in the most explicit terms that my pen can command, to repudiate and hurl back upon

Mr. Malins and his supporters the charge of either advocating or countenancing a policy of excluding the African or any other race, or of aiding any party that wishes to do so. I, as well as the loyal section of Good Templars, contend for the inclusion of the negro race, hundreds of whom are now members of the Order, and hundreds more of whom would have been if it had not been for the impossibility of getting charters of incorporation, arising from the opposition of Mr. Malins to the granting of duplicate charters ; and I distinctly charge upon Mr. Malins, and the British representatives who supported him, the wrong of hindering the issue of these charters, and thereby preventing the ingress of the coloured population of the South into the Order. Let there be no mistake upon this point. I appeal to the record ! and all I ask is an examination of the evidence contained in the pamphlet which Mr. Malins took so long a time to meet ; and if more proof be required, I ask the reader's candid attention to the additional corroborations in the following pages. The imposture which has been attempted is a daring one ; but I have confidence in appealing to the common sense fairness of the British nation, and I feel assured that they will not allow the noble sentiment of hatred to slavery and wrong which animates the bosom of the people, to be made the medium of perpetrating a great wrong against the R.W.G.L., and of foisting a delusion upon a section of the Order in this country, and upon the nation also.

## I.—FOUNDATION PRINCIPLES.

Mr. Malins opens his reply by a dissertation upon what he calls the FOUNDATION PRINCIPLES of the Order. He does not, however, attempt to prove or justify any of his statements by referring to any of the standard authorities or documents of the Order, except it be in the allusion he makes to the questions proposed to candidates on their admission to the Order. He says :—

Now we have spoken of principles, for the Order is the depositary of more than one vital principle. It has a triple foundation, as it has a triple motto. These foundations may be designated as Temperance, Fraternity, and Divinity. They find expression in the rule which requires every candidate to make certain answers to questions put before admission to membership.

These may be designated the A, B, C, and may be summarised thus :—(A) I will practice abstinence from intoxicants ; (B) I believe in Universal Brotherhood ; (C) I acknowledge my Creator. And no person who is unprepared to abstain, or who objects to act in harmony with the principle of Universal Brotherhood, or who fails to acknowledge an overruling Providence, can righteously become or remain a Good Templar, much less be a leader in the Order. (See page 5.)



Now, what are the questions propounded? They are as follows :—

P.W.C.T.: Will you be obedient to all the laws and rules of this Institution, they not conflicting with your duties as a citizen or as a Christian?—Answer: I will.

P.W.C.T.: Will you take a solemn pledge to abstain for ever from the use of, or giving to others as a beverage, anything that will intoxicate?—Answer: I will

P.W.C.T.: Do you believe in the existence of Almighty God, the Ruler and Governor of all things?—Answer: I do.

The reader will see that in these questions there is not the slightest allusion to the point (B) raised by Mr. Malins.

But perhaps it will be asked, is it not found elsewhere? Is it not contained in the platform of principles, or in the obligation which the candidate takes upon entering the Order, or in the Constitution? I will give these, and then the reader can judge for himself.

The following is the platform of principles as adopted at the R.W.G. Lodge Session, 1859 :—

1st. Total abstinence from all intoxicating liquors as a beverage.

2nd. No license, in any form, or under any circumstances, for the sale of such liquors to be used as a beverage.

3rd. The absolute prohibition of the manufacture, importation, and sale of intoxicating liquors for such purpose—prohibition by the will of the people, expressed in due form of law, with the penalties deserved for a crime of such enormity.

4th. The creation of a healthy public opinion upon the subject by the active dissemination of truth in all the modes known to an enlightened philanthropy.

5th. The election of good, honest men to administer the laws.

6th. Persistence in efforts to save individuals and communities from so direful a scourge, against all forms of opposition and difficulty, until our success is complete and universal." (See Chase's "Digest," page 207.)

The following are the pledges undertaken in the obligation :—

1st. The candidate is required to express his "full belief in the existence and power of Almighty God."

2nd. He is asked to promise that "he will not make, buy, sell, use, furnish, or cause to be furnished to others, as a beverage, any spirituous or malt liquors, wine or cider, and that in all honourable ways he will discountenance their use in the community."

3rd. That he "will not reveal any of the private work or business of the Order to anyone not entitled to know the same."

4th. That "in all things he will yield a cheerful obedience to the laws, rules, and usages of the Order."

5th. That he "will not knowingly wrong a member of the Order, or see one wronged."

6th. That he will do all in his power to promote the good of the Order, and advance the cause of temperance.

I think it will not be out of place here to insert one or two comments upon the above from the pen of Mr. Gladstone, taken from his book on Good Templary. He says :—

Obedience to law, and not lawlessness, is essential to our work being accomplished.

Those who will not honour our laws, nor seek their improvement by the methods prescribed, must either lie under the ban of violated pledges or leave the Order.

Again :—

The selfseeker is a usurper here, as he is everywhere. The man who would wrong his brethren to secure his own honour does what in him lies to lay the axe to the root of the brotherhood. Self-seeking, lust of praise, anxiety for honour, readiness to take offence, disposition to magnify trifles,—these are the dangers which, if not avoided, will do much to hinder our good work. And from all these we shall be delivered if we but remember our obligation neither knowingly to wrong or see wronged a member of our Order. (See “ Good Templarism,” by Mr. Gladstone, pages 111 and 114.)

In addition to the platform of principles and the obligation, there is also the declaration of principles contained in the Constitution—the one to which I referred in my former tract—which is as follows :—

No person can be admitted to membership in this Order unless he believes in the existence of Almighty God as the Ruler and Governor of all things, *and is willing to take our pledge for life*; under this rule we welcome all classes to our Order. The young, that we may save them from falling into the snares of the tempter; the inebriate, *who earnestly desires to reform*, that we may assist him to break the chains of appetite that bind him to the car of ruin; the moral and social, that by uniting all these elements of society, we may the better advance the cause of Temperance and Morality. (See Chase’s “ Digest,” page 28.)

In the passages which I have given, I have quoted all the laws which touch upon the foundation principles of the Order, and the only reference which there is to the doctrine of fraternity propounded by Mr. Malins, is the one passage in the Constitution which says—*under this rule we welcome all classes to our Order*.

I have thought it needful to give these extracts in order to place before the reader the true relationship of Good Templary to the question in dispute. I have no wish to minimize its teachings, but, at the same time, they ought not to be magnified into something which they are not, in order to afford to Mr. Malins the semblance of a plea of justification in the strange course which he has adopted. Like all other temperance organisations and Christian Churches, the Order of Good Templars is open to all who fulfil the conditions of membership, the declaration “ *We welcome all classes* ” stamps it as a world-embracing organisation. But here the question presents itself, How can it best secure the world in its embrace? Are the vast territories that lie in desert waste all to be cultivated in the same hard and fast manner, or left to perish? Are the stony fields of prejudice and social caste to lie waste rather than that there should be any change in the *modus operandi* of the action required to operate upon them? Are the morasses and stagnant ponds which exist in society to continue to emit their deadly vapours



simply because the machinery which is suited to better lands is not found to be adapted to their renovation? What an outrage it is upon common sense to argue thus! And yet this is the philosophy of Mr. Malins.

Touching the doctrine of Universal Brotherhood, the reader will at once see, that in this respect the Good Templar Order is but the same as every other temperance organisation and every Christian Church, and indeed, I may say, every philanthropic association in the world. They are all open to receive all who are willing to comply with the conditions of membership. Perhaps, of the lot, the Good Templar Order is the least so; for in most, if not all, the other organisations, compliance with the conditions of membership ensure undisputed admittance,—there is no power to prevent it,—but in Good Templary five black-balls will keep out any person from the Order whatever may be his fitness for the same. This is not the case in other societies, and therefore I say that in Good Templary there is really not so much of the Universal Brotherhood principle as is found in other societies, because in its laws there are checks to admission which in other bodies have no existence.

By what process of reasoning, then, does Mr. Malins seek to establish his fundamental principle touching Human Brotherhood? I ask the reader's careful attention to this. Does he get it from the platform of principles, or from the obligation, or from the Constitution? No; the only declaration upon this point is the one—“*Under this rule we welcome all classes to our Order.*” From whence, then, does Mr. Malins seek to get his authority? He quotes myself, and he quotes Colonel Hickman at the London conference, but he places a completely false construction upon our language, and deduces conclusions therefrom which have not the slightest warrant in the language used.

And here, will the reader permit me a momentary digression?

On page 12 of my tract I object to Mr. Gladstone's Louisville resolution as being unconstitutional, on the ground that it introduces principles alien to the original notice of motion which was given by Mr. Malins; and let the reader remember, my objection was taken upon a point touching the order of public business, and not of Good Templar law. Mr. Malins, however, applies it in the latter sense. He says:—

Mr. Hoyle's assertion that our amendment was “out of order” would have more weight had it come from one experienced in Good Templar law. Those who know him will be aware that he is obviously unfit to lay down the law to men who have spent more months than he has hours in its study, and as if from his *ipse dixit* there was no appeal. Is he a competent exponent of our laws, rules, and usages? Perhaps some may say that he has been G.W. Treasurer. This is true. But it proves no special fitness to sit in judgment on those whom he assails. (See page 35.)

Here the reader will see that Mr. Malins repudiates my opinion as being of any weight in Good Templar law. Of course I never said it was ; but, as I have said, the point upon which I ventured an opinion in regard to Mr. Gladstone's amendment was not a point of Good Templar law, but a point relating to the right procedure in regard to the order of public business. It, however, served Mr. Malins's purpose to raise the objection as to the value of my opinion, and so he raised it.

And, perhaps, the reader will say, What has this to do with the point now being discussed ? I will show him.

Mr. Malins opens his reply to me by laying down certain foundation principles as forming the basis of Good Templary. He says that there is a triad of these, viz.: (A) Abstinence from intoxicants. (B) Belief in Universal Brotherhood. (C) Acknowledgment of the Creator ; and the main evidence upon which he rests these foundation principles is my own statement touching the Constitution, and upon this he places quite a different construction from that which the language will bear.

I would ask,—Is it possible that the person who, on page 35 of his pamphlet, Mr. Malins characterises as being “*obviously unfit to lay down the law,*” can on page 5 of the same tract be worthy of such confidence as to warrant his statement being made the authority on which to rest proof of one of the foundation principles of the Order. As I have shown, my statement warrants no such construction as Mr. Malins puts upon it ; but if it did, is a fundamental principle to be based upon the opinion of a man “*obviously unfitted*” to give an opinion ? and yet it is upon this quicksand of manufactured authority that he bases his very foundation principles ! Surely, special pleading could not further go ! The man who, after 17 weeks' search, could seriously resort to such foundation proof, must have been hard up which way to turn.

The reader of Mr. Malins's tract will notice how often he refers to pro-slavery ideas, &c. He knows how such terms tend to create prejudice against us and bring sympathy to them. He proceeds to institute a comparison between the pro-slavery prejudice of the Southern States and the drink prejudice in England. He says :—

The pro-slavery prejudice in the South goes on all fours with the pro-drink prejudice in England, and if there is a particle of room for the lodgment of either of these prejudices in Mr. Hoyle's Order, I rejoice in belonging to a very different Order. I may sympathise with those in England who partake of the drink prejudice, but they cannot stand upon our foundation of Total Abstinence until they cease thus to partake. I may sympathise with the whites in the Southern States who partake of the colour prejudice, but they cannot stand upon our foundation of Universal Brotherhood until they cease thus to partake. (See page 7.)



My reply to all this sophistry is, that outside Mr. Malins's own imagination, or those who are deluded with him, no such comparison is possible, from the simple fact that only one of the two factors in the comparison has an existence. Total abstinence is one of the specified conditions of Good Templar membership—the pledge must be taken for life ;—but where is there a word in the conditions of membership or anywhere else that compels acquiescence in certain ideas of social equality as a condition of membership. In an Order created to eradicate intemperance and save poor drunkards, he would be a strange Good Templar indeed who refused to save a poor drunkard because he had certain peculiar and, perhaps, erroneous notions as to the social status of individuals. When men have taken a false step, and are determined to go on, what absurdities they are led into !!

I do not think that I can lay before the reader a better idea of the condition of things socially in the Southern States than by quoting an extract from the report of the Rev. H. M. Mood, G.W.C.T. of South Carolina, read to the Grand Lodge of that State, April 28th, 1874. I quote from the *Watchword* of January 31st, of this year, page 66.

At the G.L. of South Carolina, held at Columbia, April 28th, 1874, the Rev. H. M. Mood, G.W.C.T., made the following remarks in his report :—

#### THE COLOURED PEOPLE OF THE STATE.

While the Order of Good Templars is designed to be universal, embracing all nationalities, and while it is admirably adapted to all people of the State, nevertheless, such is the condition of society, that it would be very inexpedient, indeed, suicidal for the Order, to entangle itself in the social question now agitating the country, by attempting to introduce the Order among the coloured people of the State, unless the R.W.G.L. will permit a District Grand Lodge and subordinate lodges, composed exclusively of coloured people.

This should be done for the following reasons :—

1.—The inebriety of the coloured people calls for vigorous Temperance effort among them.

2.—In different parts of the State a movement has been made by the coloured people to unite with the Order, but the social question has prevented.

3.—The coloured people of the State greatly prefer separation from the whites in any enterprise having social intercourse, as is indicated by all Church and educational movements.

4.—The whites will never submit to a union with coloured persons in their lodges.

5.—The Order ought to be able to adjust itself to the social necessities of the case, if it propose universal extension.

6.—White and coloured subordinate lodges, under the supervision of two independent Grand Lodges, can carry on their operations in the State without interference with each other.

7.—The coloured people of the South are now barred from the benefits of the Order, and will remain so unless some adjustment be made.

8.—To throw open the lodges, as they now exist, to the admission of coloured people will be to destroy the Order, not only in South Carolina, as far as the whites are concerned, but in the whole South.

9.—The adjustment proposed will at once open a new, large, and inviting field for philanthropic and temperance effort.

10.—One chief design of the Order is prohibitory penal enactments against the manufacture, sale, and use of spirituous liquors as a beverage, which cannot be accomplished in this State unless we enlist the coloured people in the effort. With their help we can succeed.

The report which Mr. Malins himself presented to the Grand Lodge at Preston touching the Madison Session, 1872, is strongly confirmatory of these statements. In the former part of it he says :—

THE NEGRO QUESTION.—It falls to my lot to report the singular incidents which occurred at the R.W.G.L. during the discussion of this, to me, unexpected topic. Our supreme head, acting upon its long recognised solicitude for the welfare of all the sons of men, has thrown open our portals to the Indian and negro as well as the white race. A few lodges have been formed in the Southern States, some of which have a coloured membership. This fact prevents the whites from joining an Order which would of necessity require the fraternal recognition of those who may but lately have left the house of bondage. The brethren of Kentucky and Tennessee, desiring the adhesion of the whites, and at the same time yearning for the salvation of the coloured people, yet realising the fact that they cannot at present become co-equal workers together, would bow to expediency and permit such Southern Grand lodges as may in future be formed to revoke the charters which give the coloured lodges within their jurisdiction full powers of representation, &c., and grant them in lieu thereof another charter and ritual specially framed for the exclusive use of these people.

I quote the above, first, because I believe they give a correct picture of the social difficulties which stand in the way of philanthropic effort in the Southern States. Those who have read Nordoff's book on the Southern States, or any other standard book, will agree with this. And, secondly, because it shows the anxiety of some of the whites to do something to remedy the evil, and it also shows the necessity which exists that something should be done to save the negroes, and bring them to stand shoulder to shoulder with the whites in carrying the prohibition of the liquor traffic.

But, if Mr. Malins's representations of the doctrine of Fraternity were accepted, and that to the fullest extent, the action that he and his friends took at Louisville was such as completely to defeat the attainment of the end desired. What was wanted was, to bring about such fraternal arrangements in the Southern States as would secure to the coloured people all the privileges that the whites enjoyed, and enable them to visit in each other's lodges, and, as soon as possible, bring them to meet together in the same lodges, irrespective of race and colour. This is what we seek to secure, but the action of Mr. Malins and his



friends completely destroys the possibility of this ; for of what use can a Birmingham password be to the negroes in these States, so long as all the white lodges and perhaps many of the negro lodges in the same States are using a totally different password ? With such a password they can only meet in their own lodges ; the fraternity sought to be attained becomes impossible, inasmuch as they have not the key which is needed to open the door of social and brotherly intercourse with the brethren and neighbours by whom they are surrounded.

Since the above passage has been in type, I have received a copy of the *New York Daily Witness*, containing a letter from Mr. J. N. Stearns, a leading temperance man in America, and corresponding secretary of the American Temperance Society, who has been on a visit to the Southern States, and has spent a month in investigating the social condition of the population. Amongst other things, he says, writing from North Carolina, under date of March 22nd of this year :—

The English seceding Good Templars have had a “missionary” organising lodges in this State ; and efforts have also been made in Florida, and other Southern States. *They cannot give the Order of Good Templars to the negro, but have a different ritual and a foreign password. One important result of this foreign organisation is to array the blacks against the whites, and aid in perpetuating the colour line.* I have found the white members of the Order South, everywhere I have been, entirely ready to organise the coloured people into lodges and Grand Lodges of their own as they desire, and hope all the Southern States will soon follow the example of Georgia.

Raleigh, North Carolina, March 22, 1877.

J. N. STEARNS.

There are two points in the preceding letter that should be well noted.

1st. That the action taken by the British is defeating the end professedly in view, viz., instead of promoting fraternity it is arraying the blacks against the whites, and perpetuating the colour line.

2nd. It does not give the Order of Good Templary to the negroes, but another Order, with a different password ; and hence again, in this manner, the fraternal object is defeated.

In my former tract I said (see page 24) :—

The action of the British representatives is one to be regretted, as it is calculated to prevent this brotherhood of the races by inducing irritation of feeling in the South, and thus lessening the prospects of that unity which is so much to be desired.

So it has come to pass.

'The question which presents itself is not, Shall there be any sacrifice of principle ? nobody dreams of suggesting this, but, Shall there be any adaptation of the efforts put forth with a view to overcome the peculiar difficulties which here stand in the way ?

Let it not be forgotten that there is principle involved not only in holding for the truth, but in holding for it and propagating it in a manner in harmony with the foundation principles of Christianity, and of the Order of Good Templars, which is based upon the same foundation, viz., the truth in love, *i.e.*, charity.

The most successful preacher, probably, that the world ever saw, and also the most zealous defender of Human Brotherhood—the Apostle Paul—writing to the Corinthians, says :—

“And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews ; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law.

To them that are without law, as without law (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ), that I might gain them that are without law.

To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak. I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some, and this I do for the Gospel’s sake.

This is the teaching of Christianity, and, in an Order whose motto is Faith, Hope, and Charity, it ought to find a like exemplification.

## II.—THE BRICK ARGUMENT.

Mr. Malins heads his second chapter with the title, “THE CROOKED BRICK,” and the entire phraseology of the chapter is so designed as to convey to the mind of the reader the idea that we are pleading for pro-slavery ideas and prejudices ; but such imputations are slanders—I had almost said, deliberate slanders. In my tract I refer to the dark days of slavery, and to the fact that most of the Southerners have been educated under the influences of those days of darkness ; and who can gainsay this ? And I further say, that the existence of this evil in the South has coloured the prejudices and influenced the social relations of the people. Who can gainsay this ? If these statements be true, I argue that in any action which may be taken in those States, the same will need to be regulated as much as possible, so that whilst there shall be no sacrifice of principle, there shall not be any needless collision with the prejudices which prevail ; for, as I have said, these prejudices can only be removed by the dissemination of the truth, and any irritation that prevents the free access of the truth, renders the remedy for the evil all the more difficult.

If there be any point in the chimney illustration of Mr. Malins, it is this : The chimney is intended to represent the Good Templar movement, the bricks with which it is to be built up are the various social elements of society ; all these are sought to be formed into one grand edifice on the bases of teetotalism, prohibition, and belief in God. Some



of the social bricks, however, are a little angular, others are a little too rough, whilst some are too soft, they not having been sufficiently long in the fire-kiln of civilisation. Now, these bricks do not readily dovetail one into another; they need some of their angularities knocking off, they want some of their roughness polishing down, or they require a little more hardening in the kiln; and when the workman asks for a little time so that he may attend to these matters, No! says Mr. Malins, if the bricks are uncouth and not of the prescribed pattern, you must spend no time in trimming them, but throw them away. What we say is, don't destroy the bricks! but try to polish off their irregularities so as to make them fitted to become parts of the grand edifice which we are seeking to erect.

### III.—THE ALLEGED LEGAL VIOLATION OF FOUNDATION PRINCIPLES.

Mr. Malins begins his third chapter by saying—

Mr. Hoyle confirms our worst fears. In referring to the introduction of the Order by the R.W.G.L. into the Southern States, and the consequent formation of Grand Lodges whose Executive officers must be residents of such States, he makes the astounding declaration that—

He then gives the following quotation from the middle of a paragraph on page 4 of my tract:—

Inasmuch as the Executive authority was, by the law of the Order, thus obliged to be from within such States or countries, it must necessarily partake more or less of existing prejudices, and be subject to the prevailing influences.

The idea that Mr. Malins conveys to the mind of the reader is this, that I am arguing that when the officials of the R.W.G.L. go to form Grand Lodges they must have an eye to the selection of men who partake of the local prejudices; but such a construction is wholly unwarranted by my language. My point was this—that when Grand Lodges are formed among peoples that universally entertain certain prejudices, there is no possibility of getting officers who are not tainted with the prevailing prejudices. I was simply stating a matter of fact, and giving a reason why Grand Lodges in the Southern States are not so fully educated upon the rights of man principle as ourselves and others, and therefore need a little forbearance.

The same difficulty exists in our own country, though it may manifest itself in a different manner, and to a less degree. There are very few Roman Catholics, and not a great number of Churchmen, who are willing to join the Order and associate with others upon equal

terms, or indeed at all : they have their prejudices in relation to the matter of religious equality, as well as other phases of social life. Now, if Good Templary be instituted in districts where these ideas prevail, it is obliged to take the population as it exists. In Wales, almost every Good Templar Lodge will be thoroughly in favour of religious equality, being, as they are, permeated by the prevailing ideas of the principality. In some districts in England it is quite the opposite, so much so, that certain sections of the people refuse to associate with those who are of a different creed ; and why not set Good Templary to correct the prejudices of religious as well as of social caste ? The truth is, that it has nothing to do with either, except to see that its doors are not barred either by caste or prejudice against those who wish to enter the Order, and who are willing to comply with the conditions.

But then it may be said, do you not admit that the Constitution of the Order is founded upon the Universal Brotherhood of Man principle ? Most certainly ! but not as an article of the Good Templar Creed, for a belief in social equality is no more required from a Good Templar, than is a belief in religious equality ; still, whilst Good Templary does not prescribe the individual creed upon these points, it does require that these opinions should not be permitted to operate so as to close the door to any class or race of people who desire to be enrolled in the Order ; in this way, and in this way only, does the Order take its stand upon the Brotherhood of Man. The aim of the Order is to promote abstinence and secure prohibition ; it is a condition of membership that those who are admitted shall be abstainers, and in favour of prohibition ; and it is its mission to secure the advancement of these principles. On the other hand, it is no part of its work to start a propaganda in favour of equal rights, indeed, as I have shown, it is no part of a Good Templar's creed ; and Mr. Malins, in making it the FOUNDATION PRINCIPLE of his argument, only demonstrates the fact, that he needed to conjure up some plea that did not already exist, in order to enable him to give the semblance of a justification to his most unjustifiable and traitorous action.

#### IV.—THE ALLEGED OMNIPOTENCE OF GRAND LODGES.

In my tract I argued that owing to the way in which the Constitution is framed, Grand Lodges have autocratic powers in the States to decide who shall be admitted. Now this is a principle that is thoroughly sound in itself, for it is founded upon the righteous principle of local self-government, and upon the common sense assumption that the residents in a



State or country are far more likely to be able to judge as to the eligibility of parties for membership than a foreign body is ; but the misfortune has been, that this principle, though so excellent in itself, owing to the peculiar relations of the people of the Southern States, has not worked satisfactorily.

Let us see what the laws of the Order say touching the respective jurisdictions of the R.W.G. Lodge and of Grand Lodges. The following is from the R.W.G. Lodge Constitution :—

No more than one Grand Lodge shall be chartered in any State, district, or territory. All grand bodies working under charters granted by this Grand Lodge are supreme for all local legislation and appellate jurisdiction within their respective limits, except as hereinafter provided. (See Chase's "Digest," page 12.)

Article 10. When a Grand Lodge shall be duly chartered in any State, district, territory, province, or country, all the lodges in said State, district, territory, province, or country, working under the jurisdiction of this Grand Lodge, shall thereafter be declared subordinate to, and under the jurisdiction of, the Grand Lodge of the State, district, territory, province, or country in which they are located, and no lodge situated in one State, district, territory, province, or country, can be made subordinate to the Grand Lodge of any other State, district, territory, province, or country. (See Chase's "Digest," page 23.)

The following is taken from the Grand Lodge Constitution :—

Section 2. Jurisdiction.—This Grand Lodge shall have jurisdiction over all subordinate lodges and degree temples of Good Templars now existing, or which may hereafter exist in the——of——. It shall have the sole right and power to grant, suspend, or revoke charters, to originate and regulate the means of its own support, and to receive and decide appeals and determine all questions of law and usage subject to the R.W.G. Lodge of North America. (See Chase's "Digest," page 29.)

Now, from the above, as well as from other extracts which might be given, it will be seen—

1. That prior to the passing of Judge Black's amendment, 1875, the R.W.G.L. had not even power to institute a second Grand Lodge in any State or territory.

2. That touching the jurisdiction in all matters not specified in the Constitution as appertaining to the R.W.G.L., Grand Lodges are supreme ; and as the decision of who is to be admitted into the Order is not among the specified duties, but is specified as being in the province of Grand Lodges, therefore the R.W.G.L. has been unable to take the prompt action needed to correct the evil.

3. That the Grand Lodges of one State or country can have no jurisdiction in the territory of another.

4. That Grand Lodges have the sole right and power to grant, suspend, or revoke charters within their respective territories.

Mr. Malins himself admits the whole argument on page 40, where, when he is trying to show the defect of Dr. Oronhyatekha's substitute, he quotes from Major Talbot. I give two extracts :—

2.—There is no remedy for the violation of the acknowledged spirit of our Order in Constitution of this R.W.G. Lodge.

5.—Nothing short of an amendment of the R.W.G.L. Constitution, reserving the right to the R.W.G.L. to correct this evil, will answer the demands of justice and right.

Mr. Malins can see the truth when it serves his purpose.

In dealing with the question of Grand Lodges Mr. Malins misrepresents me, as he does in almost everything he quotes from me. He quotes me as if I were the unqualified advocate of this omnipotence of the Grand Lodges. He says :—

The endorsement by Mr. Hoyle of such an assumption of power is all that the most bitter Southerner could desire, guaranteeing as it does, his right to do wrong unmolested.

Now such statements on the part of Mr. Malins are most unfair ; for, I simply stated a fact. I did not endorse or advocate it ; on the contrary, in the tract from which he quotes, I suggested as the remedy such a reform of the Constitution as would do away with the autocratic power of Grand Lodges. I said :—

The only feasible plan left was to seek to amend the Constitution, so as *to deprive Grand Lodges* of the supreme authority and power which they now enjoy in their several jurisdictions, and to make it lawful for the R.W.G.L. to step in, or to authorise others to step in, and enrol the people who are neglected by the Grand Lodges.

I think myself that recent events have shown that the Grand Lodge of England under Mr. Malins is as much in need of a supreme authority over it, to correct its exclusive policy, as are any of the Southern Grand Lodges of America.

Mr. Malins again misrepresents me touching the doctrine of State rights. I am no more an apologist for these than I am for the omnipotence of Grand Lodges, and I would only support them so far as they are in harmony with the freedom and general good of the whole community. State authorities, like Good Templar authorities, sometimes do very absurd and foolish things, and in the case of both, when these absurdities interfere with individual freedom or the general good, it is well that there should be in existence a higher authority to bring the erring ones back to duty.



## V.—THE ALLEGED IRRESPONSIBILITY OF THE R.W.G. LODGE.

In his fifth chapter, Mr. Malins dwells upon the point as to THE ALLEGED IRRESPONSIBILITY OF THE R.W.G. LODGE. He quotes a passage from my tract, and then comments as follows :—

But when the R.W.G. Lodges grant charters to Grand Lodges, those receiving them solemnly vow that they will be faithful to the principles of the Orders ; yet Mr. Hoyle indicates that a Grand Lodge may determine and set at nought a code understood from same principles.

The point I want here specially to call attention to is this, the vow that Grand Lodges, and subordinate lodges too, take, and which Mr. Malins seeks to make a matter of so much solemnity ; it is this, *We welcome all classes to our Order*. The reader may judge from this of the amount of exaggerated straining done by Mr. Malins, who, for want of arguments, uses hard, high-flown, catching words ; hence he introduces the words pro-slavery, &c., knowing how such expressions operate upon an English mind. Such proceedings, however, are very unfair, for they convey entirely false ideas, indirectly insinuating that we are the abettors of slavery ; and the man who conveys a false idea knowingly, is as guilty as the man who utters a false expression.

Mr. Malins goes on to say (page 9) :—

Surely the Supreme Court has no real supremacy, if it has no power to interfere “in fundamental matters.” Yet, the R.W.G. Lodge was supreme. Now, can a Supreme Court logically or honestly abrogate its powers to enforce upon its subordinates the fundamental principles upon which it is founded—upon which its very existence is based ?

This is very plausible but very sophistical reasoning on the part of Mr. Malins. No one knows better than he does that even a “*Supreme Court*” must govern on the principles laid down in the Constitution, until the said Constitution be amended, hence what they should have done should have been, to correct the imperfections of the Constitution, so as to have enabled the R.W.G. Lodge to exercise a supremacy not in theory only, but in reality, by giving it specific authority to take action against those who did not carry out the admitted principles of the Order.

Mr. Malins proceeds to institute a contrast in which he compares the Parliament of England to the R.W.G. Lodge of the I.O.G.T., and the licensing magistrates to the Grand Lodges. His words are :—

Perhaps too, when Mr. Hoyle next blames a member of Parliament for voting in favour of license laws, the member of Parliament will impress upon Mr. Hoyle the

fact that Parliament does not grant licenses. The district authorities do it under the law; but never Parliament!! Now it will be readily seen that Parliament is in no sense to blame, &c., according to Mr. Hoyle's argument. (See page 10.)

The above attempted analogy falls to the ground, for, to make it analogous, there should be—

1st. A Parliament that has declared licensing to be wrong, just as the R.W.G. Lodge has declared the shutting out of the negro to be wrong;

2nd. There should be a local jurisdiction with full powers given by Parliament to deal with the drink question, just as Grand Lodges have full power to deal with the negro question.

Now, neither of these conditions exist; and therefore the comparison is utterly wide of the mark.

If Parliament were to establish County Boards, as some people suggest, and were to relegate to them full authority to abolish all licenses, and further, if Parliament were to declare that all citizens ought to be protected from the evils of the liquor traffic, and public-houses prohibited, then the comparison would be analogous, and the member of Parliament would be fully justified in such a statement as Mr. Malins puts into his mouth.

In such a case the analogy would be true to fact; but Mr. Malins's comparison lacks the conditions—they are not identical. So it is in almost everything he adduces. He strains and exaggerates all he touches.

## VI.—THE HISTORY.—MADISON SESSION.

With Mr. Malins's opening paragraph touching the action of the Southerners at the reception given by the Capitol Lodge I have nothing to do, as it does not affect the question at issue, for, if all he says were true, it only confirms the fact as to the difficulties that the R.W.G.L. had to encounter in dealing with the Southern population.

As Mr. Malins has woven into his narrative this little incident about the negroes at the reception with a view to create prejudice against the R.W.G.L., I think that I ought to give the reader an incident which shows how the R.W.G. Lodge itself receives the negro. It is recorded in Pierce's "History of the Order," published by the Grand Lodge of England (page 237), and occurred at the session of 1868. Mr. Pierce describes the incident as follows:—

The minority report was ably and eloquently advocated by Bro. Timothy G. Needham, of Kentucky. The rules were suspended, and Bro. Needham was by unanimous vote allowed all the time he should desire to speak upon this question.



When the Grand Body adjourned on the afternoon he still had the floor. When it convened in the evening he resumed his remarks. He eloquently portrayed the effects of such a decision, if persisted in, in his own State particularly, as regarded the Order he so much and so dearly loved. Just as he was all in a glow with his graphic picture, and as he turned and pointed to the inner door, with the words upon his lips, "Worthy Templars, just so sure as you allow coloured persons to enter that door"—just at this moment half-a-dozen coloured Good Templars entered the door accidentally, the Inside Guard admitting them without being aware of what was transpiring in the debate. The incident was so striking that, like an electric shot, the large audience broke out into a prolonged round of applause, which, ere it died away, was succeeded by a second and a third. The scene was magnificent. There stood the speaker, uniting with the amusement the scene occasioned, and receiving the inspiration of the general good feeling prevailing. As the last round of applause died away the speaker good-naturedly exclaimed, "Who got that up?" when the audience broke out into another hearty round of applause. Perhaps there was nothing occurred, or could have occurred, that did so much to produce harmony of feeling amid such diverse views as happened on this occasion.

In the next paragraph reference is made to the memorial presented from Alabama, &c., and the words "*which was not read*" are italicised. On page 13, Mr. Malins again refers to this as follows:—"Let the reader realise that the foul memorial above quoted was not read to the body."

Now the design of these remarks, in reference to the memorial not being read, is to convey to the reader's mind the idea that there was some underhand work going on, whereas the memorial was treated just as other memorials were, for it is the practice to refer them unread to some committee, unless some member calls for the reading, which in this case was not done.

I will now give a history of what took place at the Madison Session touching this question, and then I will make a few comments thereon.

On the second day of the session, the Committee on Memorials submitted the following report (see R.W.G.L. journal for 1872, page 44):—

Your Committee on Petitions and Memorials beg leave to submit the following report as to the matters contained in the memorial signed by W. E. H. Searcy, G.W.S. of Georgia, and A. S. Elliott, G.W.S. of Alabama, in reference to the future relationship of the coloured population of America to our Order, and unanimously recommend the following:—

I.—That the exclusive control of all the questions involved in the matter of admitting coloured persons to membership in our Order should be left entirely to the Grand Lodges already organised, or to be organised in the territory of the late slave-holding States.

II.—Inasmuch as your Committee, from personal knowledge and information which they deem reliable, as well as by the language of the memorialists themselves, are assured that a separate and distinct organisation for them is the only means of their recovering from the curse of the liquor traffic in those States. We there-

fore unanimously recommend that this R.W.G. Lodge cause to be prepared and furnished for the exclusive use of the coloured race a ritual and other supplies necessary for their successful and speedy organisation.

III.—For the purpose of insuring the speedy consummation of their organisation and equipments, we recommend that our present rituals, charters, &c., be used, after striking out from the name of the Order the word “Good” and inserting the word “Coloured,” with a suitable change in the unwritten work, and that the same be furnished by the R.W.G.S. as all other supplies are now furnished, and at the same price.

IV.—We are of opinion that the necessary expenses of this change should be borne by the States benefited thereby, and that the same be apportioned by the R.W.G.S. between the Grand Lodges now in existence in the South, and so recommend.

V.—We further recommend that the present G.W.C.T.’s and G.W.S.’s of the said Grand Lodges have the charge of the introduction of the said Order, and that the G.W. Secretaries shall keep a general oversight of the same, and report the general progress and success to the next session of this body, and to the future sessions also, if hereafter deemed advisable.

TIM NEEDHAM, S. J. UNDERWOOD, W. S. WILLIAMS, ANNIE WEICHMANN, D. BOYD,	}	Committee.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	------------

Representative Ellis, of Michigan, offered the following substitute :—

Resolved—In view of the late and present peculiar relation to races in a part of our jurisdiction, we hereby leave all regulations in regard to that matter in the hands of the several Grand Lodges.

Brother Giles moved that the report, and all questions involved therein, be referred to a special committee of five, consisting of Brothers Stearns, Hickman, Orne, Chase, and Whitten, with instructions to report at the earliest practicable time. This was lost.

Later on in the same day the discussion of the report of the Committee on Memorials, and Representative Ellis’s substitute, was then resumed. (See R.W.G.L. journal for 1872, page 47.)

On motion, the time of the session was extended until six o’clock.

REPRESENTATIVE MALINS OFFERED THE FOLLOWING AS AN AMENDMENT TO REPRESENTATIVE ELLIS’S SUBSTITUTE :—

RESOLVED—THAT THIS R.W. GRAND LODGE CONFERS UPON SUCH GRAND LODGES AS MAY REQUIRE IT THE POWER TO TAKE SUCH STEPS TO PROMOTE TEMPERANCE AMONG THE COLOURED PEOPLE, IN SUCH A MANNER AS MAY BE DEEMED BEST SUITED TO THEIR WANTS, TO THE EXTENT, IF NECESSARY, OF FORMING AN ESPECIAL ORGANISATION FOR THEIR BENEFIT; PROVIDED THAT NO PART OF THE NAME OR RITUAL OF OUR ORDER BE APPLIED TO ANY ORGANISATION OTHER THAN OUR OWN.

It was moved that the report and amendments be referred back to the Committee. Carried. A motion to adjourn was not adopted.



The Committee on Memorials again submitted a report on the Georgia and Alabama petition as follows :—

Officers and Members,—We, your Committee, to whom was re-referred the report heretofore submitted on the matters contained in a certain memorial, signed by W. E. H. Searcy, G.W.S. of Georgia, and A. S. Elliott, G.W.S. of Alabama, together with all the accompanying resolutions, &c., &c., beg leave to report as follows :—

I.—We recommend that the prayer for a separate organisation among the coloured population of the Southern States be granted, and that this R.W. Grand Lodge hereby confers upon the Grand Lodges now organised, or that may hereafter be organised in any of the said Southern States, the entire control of the introduction and management of the same within their respective jurisdictions, the principle having already been recognised in the organisation of the Cold Water Templars.

II.—We further recommend that a committee of three be selected by the delegation present from the Grand Lodges South, who shall prepare a suitable ritual, charter, codes, &c., &c., for the use of the said organisation, and submit the same at as early a day as practicable to the Executive Committee of this R.W.G. Lodge, for their inspection and approval, and that, when so approved by them, the same shall be printed and kept on hand for sale by the R.W.G. Secretary, as other supplies are now done, at such prices as the said Committee, in conjunction with the Executive Committee, shall recommend; provided that but one such ritual and organisation shall be authorised.

III.—We further recommend the adoption of the following resolution, viz.:—

Resolved—That this body hereby declares that all Grand Lodges have full power, under our Constitution, to grant or refuse to grant charters to any applicants; and that no lodge can be formed or continued within the jurisdiction of any Grand Lodge against the will of such Grand Lodge.

TIM NEEDHAM, Chairman, Ky.

D. BOYD, Maine,	} Committee.
W. S. WILLIAMS, Canada,	
ANNIE WEICHMANN, Penn.,	
S. J. UNDERWOOD, Tenn.,	

This was adopted by a vote of 39 to 22.

Representative Hastings moved a reconsideration. Carried by a rising vote 36 to 17.

Representative Hastings then moved to recommit the report to the Committee, with instructions to report on the basis of Representative Malins's substitute. Carried.

On the third day the Committee again remitted back their report. (See R.W.G.L. journal for 1872, page 63.)

Brother Black moved to strike out the words "or continued" in the last resolution, upon which considerable discussion ensued.

REPRESENTATIVE MALINS AGAIN MOVED THE ADOPTION OF HIS SUBSTITUTE.

Brother Black's amendment was lost.

Representative Malins's substitute was lost.

Representative Hastings then moved the following amendment to the report :—

Resolved—That this body hereby declares that all Grand Lodges have full power, under our Constitution, to grant or refuse to grant charters to any applicants; and that no Lodge can be formed within the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge against the will of such Grand Lodge, and that a Grand Lodge has the power to revoke the charters of any Lodge within its jurisdiction, as provided by the Constitution.

Amendment carried by a vote of 48 yeas to 30 nays. Report adopted as amended.

Towards the end of the fourth day, Representative Ball moved to re-consider the vote adopting the report of the Committee on Memorials, on the Georgia and Alabama Petition. (See R.W.G.L. journal for 1872, page 78.)

Brother Black moved to lay the motion to re-consider upon the table. Carried.

Mr. Malins asks the reader's attention to what he designates a *real* history, but he omits to tell the reader that both Mr. Jabez Walker and Mr. Samuel Capper, who were present with him at Madison, protested against his resolution. They told him "*that such a resolution ought never to be presented in the name of England, and they urged him to propose a resolution which would give to the coloured people all that the whites had.*" This was advice which Mr. Malins would have done well to have adopted. Both these gentlemen unreservedly condemn the course which Mr. Malins took at Louisville.\*

In reference to the preceding history, I would remark that though the recommendation of the Committee was somewhat shortcoming, it was a much better thing than the substitute proposed by Mr. Malins, for the simple reason that it made as little change as possible from the existing Order. The change was only in the name, with a suitable alteration in the ritual; but Mr. Malins's proposal was to make the new Order radically different. The second report of the Committee was to my mind more objectionable than the first, and the change may be accounted for in the fact that being referred back to the Committee, along with Mr. Malins's resolution, it was moulded somewhat to meet it. If Mr. Malins had taken the advice of his fellow-representatives, Messrs. Walker and Capper, the result would have been the other way.

Mr. Malins himself, in reporting the Madison debate to the Preston Grand Lodge Session, intimates that his resolution had to do with the shaping of what he calls the Hatchet. He says :—

The Committee who had the resolution in hand, with my substitute, offered the following resolution :—

---

\* I was pained to hear of the action taken by the British representatives at the last R.W.G.L. in reference to the discussion on the desirability of admitting the coloured race into our Order. However much they might have differed from their brethren, the course pursued was certainly not the best way of removing a wrong. The R.W.G.L. know exactly where I stand in this matter. Both at Madison and in the great metropolis of the British Empire I stated my opinions on this subject, and they have not changed; but I certainly will not betray my former professions of love to a world-wide organisation by promoting division and secession because I cannot carry a point which I believe to be right in itself. I hope, however, a better understanding will be arrived at, and the Order remain as before, a world-wide organisation.—*Extracted from report of Jabez Walker, G.W.C.T. of California, formerly G.W.C.T. for Scotland.—Sacramento, October 3, 1876.*



That this body hereby declares that all Grand Lodges have full power to grant or refuse to grant charters to any applicants; and that no lodge can be formed, *or continue* within the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodges, against the will of such Grand Lodge; and that the Grand Lodge has the power to revoke the charter of any lodge within its jurisdiction, as provided by the Constitution.

Brother Hastings moved to strike out the words *or continue*, and upon these simple words the whole question hung.

The reader will have seen from the Madison history which I have given, that the objectionable words, OR CONTINUE, were struck out; but, as I have before said, if Mr. Malins's utterances had been thoroughly in harmony with sound principle, the legislation of Madison would have been of a more vigorous kind.

Mr. Malins says that he objected to the nearness of the likeness, because it was a bastard kind of Templary, and because "*the transformation from the genuine Order to the inferior one would be all the easier perpetrated if it resembled our own Order.*" But a little reflection will convince the reader that the argument works the other way, for the new Order was not intended to be a permanent one, and therefore, the nearer it was to Good Templary the easier would be its re-absorption into the proper Order when circumstances would permit. Mr. Malins's resolution was therefore highly objectionable.

Mr. Malins alleges that it was his intention to have voted against his own amendment, had it been carried. But he would have had no chance of doing this, for had it been carried it would have displaced the report of Committee *at once*, it being moved as a substitute, and no second vote could have been taken; his plea, therefore, falls to the ground. But if, as he says, he intended merely a "*parliamentary trick*," then it was unbecoming a British representative, who above all men, on such a question, ought to have been above tricks, and taken his stand upon principle.

Another point I wish to call the reader's attention to is this, that the report which I have given proves that the R.W.G.L. gave its sanction to the formation of an Order for the coloured people. The report, with Mr. Hastings's amendment, was adopted by 48 to 30; and the South took advantage of this, and under Colonel Hickman's lead enrolled in the Order of True Reformers over 40,000 of the negroes.

Some may find fault with the R.W.G.L. for taking this action, but certainly Mr. Malins is not the man to do it, for the R.W.G.L. was acting upon his suggestion, only they did not wish to place the negro so far away as Mr. Malins's resolution urged that they should do.

I want the reader to note another point. On page 13 of his tract, Mr. Malins says:—

We pressed our amendment and opposed the report so successfully that they withdrew the latter, but immediately produced another, which they had ready prepared.

If the reader will refer to the history as given in the journals of the R.W.G.L., he will see that Mr. Malins's statement is wholly wrong ; for, the first report was not withdrawn ; it was, along with the two amendments of Representatives Ellis and Malins, referred back to the Committee. This was before dinner of the second day ; after dinner the election of officers took place, and then the Committee re-presented their report in the evening, to discuss which the time had to be extended to six o'clock, and yet Mr. Malins says "*they immediately produced another, which they had ready prepared.*"

It will be seen, on examining the history which I have given, that the second report of the Committee and the one which was adopted contained the resolution which Mr. Malins designates *The Hatchet*, and a great fight took place upon the erasion from it of the words "*or continue.*" Brother Black moved to strike out these words, but this was lost. Representative Hastings then moved the resolution which Mr. Malins styles the Rod ; the resolution was carried, and the report as amended was adopted. The adoption of Mr. Hastings's amendment forbade the revoking of any charter by Grand Lodges, except for violation of Constitution. If Mr. Malins had been true to principle, and had moved such a resolution as he ought to have done, the chances are, that there would neither have been the Hatchet nor the Rod.

In presenting his report to the next Grand Lodge of England, which met in Preston, Mr. Malins concludes his report of the Madison Session as follows :—

I thank God that Great Britain was represented at this great gathering, and was able to turn the scale against those whom we learned to oppose and to love at the same time. Now the matter is settled, we may never expect such a contest again.

These words impress us with two thoughts :—

1st. That whatever were the virtues or defects of the Rod resolution, the British boasted of having had a determining voice in it.

2nd. That at the time Mr. Malins's view of the Madison legislation was so satisfactory as to lead him to regard the matter as settled.

MORAL.—If he was so deceived at the time, why should he now be so hard upon those who were deceived along with him ?

Mr. Malins says that when the report came up, as thus amended, he voted against it ; and, therefore, he pleads that he *did not commit himself* (see page 15) *with the R.W.G.L. to making a separate Order for the coloured people.* But such a plea is frivolous, because the report of



the R.W.G.L. was less objectionable in this respect than his own resolution. If he did not vote with the R.W.G.L., he tried to do a worse thing, but was prevented. The R.W.G.L. saved him from himself.

It will be seen that Mr. Malins here yields the admission *that the R.W.G.L. committed itself to the making a separate Order for the coloured people*; and, if we bear this in mind, and remember, too, that the Southerners worked hard to save the negroes through the instrumentality of the new organisation, it will, perhaps, modify our harsh judgment of them, and also tend to throw light upon some of the subsequent incidents which took place in the history of the Order in the South.

It does not lie within my province to discuss the question as to whether the R.W.G.L. was fully justified in the action they took in sanctioning the Order of True Reformers; but, having regard to the experience of the Sons of Temperance, when, owing to the pressing by them of the social question, the Order suffered so severely as to dwindle down from a membership of 40,000, to one division of the Order, no one can be surprised that the leaders of the Good Templar movement should be anxious to avoid the rock upon which their brethren of the other Order had been so sadly wrecked. And if they were convinced that it was the only thing that they could then do to meet the difficulty, it was their bounden duty to do it.

On page 16 of his tract, Mr. Malins gives quite a sensationally dramatic narrative of what occurred towards the end of the Madison Session; but, though he says he is giving a “*real*” history, yet he omits to mention that it was Judge Black who was struck with the happy thought to move that the motion to re-consider lie on the table,—he tells the seconder’s name but not the mover’s. Why is this left out? These omissions in “*real*” history do not add greatly to the reliability of the historian.

When I read the concluding part of Mr. Malins’s history of the Madison Session, I thought to myself, what an anxious, miserable time these Britishers must have had of it at Madison. Sure enough, I said, when they departed to their homes they would be ready to shake off the dust of their feet as a testimony against those Southerners, and their “*abettors*” the Northerners. And with these ideas in my head, I took up the R.W.G.L. journal to see if there was any record of such an event having taken place, when I found the following document (see R.W.G.L. journal, page 72):—

Representative Robert Simpson, in behalf of the English and Scottish brethren,

presented the following complimentary paper, which was ordered to be entered on the minutes :—

Whereas, the brethren composing the deputation from Great Britain and Ireland, representing the Grand Lodges of England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, at this session of the Right Worthy Grand Lodge, feeling themselves overwhelmed with a sense of the kindness and Christian affection which they have received since their arrival in this beautiful city of Madison, desire to express to the officers and to every member of the Right Worthy Grand Lodge, their deepest gratitude for such unmerited kindness. Remembering the munificent kindness of the members of Capitol Lodge, and the special, unwearied, and self-sacrificing expressions of attention and kindness they have received at the hands of our highly-esteemed and honoured brother, the Hon. S. D. Hastings, they desire to record the expression of their heartfelt thanks ; and in bidding farewell to their brethren, with whom they have enjoyed such sweet communion and fellowship, their prayer is that each one of us, as we go forth to our various fields of labour, may go determined by the strength and blessing of Almighty God to give ourselves no rest, the Churches of Christ no rest, and the upholding of the matchless, world-wide system of licensed iniquity no rest, until the last drunkard is delivered, and the last item of temptation to degrade our fellow-men shall have swept away from the face of the earth.

JABEZ WALKER, G.W.C.T., Scotland.  
JOSEPH MALINS, G.W.C.T., England.  
ROBERT SIMPSON, G.W.C., Scotland.  
SAMUEL STANTON, of England.  
SAMUEL CAPPER, of England.  
THOMAS BARCLAY, of Scotland.

It may not be uninteresting to know that at least three of the above six strongly deprecate the present action of the secessionists.

What a contrast there is between the story of 1872 and that of 1877 ! It is a thing of rare occurrence that such spontaneous declarations as the above are made. When they are, they always show that much more than an ordinary amount of pleasure and satisfaction has resulted from what has occurred. Viewed, therefore, in the light of the above declaration, we should be forced to conclude that the session at Madison must have been pre-eminently brotherly and agreeable, and, therefore, it is inexplicable that in Mr. Malins's tract in 1877 we read such expressions as the following :—“ *Inexpressibly pained* ”—“ *defiled by the remnants of the accursed system of slavery* ”—“ *hearts aching* ”—“ *cloven hoofs* ”—“ *Southern persistency and Northern abettors* ”—“ *wild excitement* ”—“ *restless nights* ”—“ *heart-rending contests* ”—“ *straining eyes and trembling hearts* ”—“ *hearts growing sick* ”—“ *heads dizzy,* ” &c. The seventeen weeks that Mr. Malins has been pondering over his reply has evidently made him somewhat melancholy, and given a stimulus to his imagination.

In 1872 it was “ *heartfelt thanks to the brethren with whom they had enjoyed such sweet communion and fellowship* ; in 1877 it is a picture of trembling suspense, sleepless anxiety, and painful distrust.



And now, with the light of this fuller history of the Madison Session, what do we find that Mr. Malins did for the negro? Nothing! The one thing he TWICE attempted to do was, to shunt them as far off Templary as possible.

## VII.—THE LONDON SESSION.

Mr. Malins heads his seventh chapter with the title, "THE ANGLO-AMERICAN DELIVERANCE." It ought to be headed THE AMERICAN-ANGLO DELIVERANCE.

On page 19, Mr. Malins has a paragraph headed—The Concession of R.W.G.T. Russell. He then goes on to say :—

I have said Hastings's Rod was "leaded." The R.W.G.T. had read in his report a decision which referred to Hastings's amendment. "The Rod" and this decision was as follows :—

5. The action of the R.W.G.L. at its late session, relating to lodges of our Order among the coloured population of the Southern States, gives to all Grand Lodges now existing, or hereafter to be organised, full power over that question within their respective jurisdictions, even to the discontinuance of subordinate lodge charters previously granted by this R.W.G.L.

I think that Mr. Malins does an injustice to R.W.G.T. Russell in charging him with making a concession. What he did was simply to declare his view as to the purport of the Madison legislation; indeed, it was well that the R.W.G. Templar did expose the defect of the Madison resolution, for it led to its being at once corrected by what Mr. Malins styles "*A grand deliverance*;" and this shows how ready the R.W.G. Lodge were to correct the error into which they had fallen, having been helped into the error probably by Mr. Malins's Madison resolution more than anything else.

At this session a memorial was presented purporting to be from ten coloured lodges in North Carolina asking for a Grand Lodge charter. Owing to the law, which forbade duplicate Grand Lodges in any State, and which was so strenuously championed by Mr. Malins, this could not be granted. The Committee, however, to whom the memorial was referred, presented a report, and among other things they recommended the passing of the following resolution :—

That all subordinate lodges within the jurisdiction of any G.L. whose charters have not been revoked or suspended for a violation of the Constitution, laws, or rules of the Order, are entitled to be recognised and receive quarterly password, and that the refusal thereof, because of race, colour, or condition, will be a violation of duty and obligation.

On the Committee which recommended the passing of above resolution there were four Americans and one Britisher. When the resolution

came before the R.W.G.L. there were thirty Americans and seven Britishers voted for it, and yet Mr. Malins can style it "THE ANGLO-AMERICAN DELIVERANCE." And here I ought to state that Judge Black—I have seen it in his own handwriting—wrote out the splendid deliverance resolution of the London Session, though he was not on the Committee. Mr. Malins apologises for the absence of Britishers on the plea of their being engaged on committee work, but surely, when a vital question is to be voted upon, those engaged in committees (for they are in the same building) should be ready to do their duty.

Mr. Gladstone ascribed this deliverance to the fact that Britishers were in force ; and yet both on the Committee and in the division in the R.W.G.L. the Americans were four to one as against the Britishers. Mr. Gladstone's blunder has been pointed out to him, but I have seen no confession of it or retraction on his part. People who write about historians being honest should be ready to confess their own errors, especially when they are of such a flagrant character as the one made by Mr. Gladstone.

Imagine a great constitutional division taking place in the House of Commons. In the division there muster 300 Conservatives and 70 Liberals. After the division the Liberals go about stumping the country and bragging of the victory as taking place because Liberals were in force. The misstatement is pointed out, and then the excuse is made that they were on committee work!! What an absurd spectacle they would present. And yet this is exactly the position of Mr. Malins and Mr. Gladstone touching the British representatives at the London Session of the R.W.G.L.

Referring to the opposition to the London resolution, Mr. Malins says, the Southerners fought desperately against it. The fact is, there were but five Southerners present ; three voted against, one for, and one (the Rev. T. L. Polson, of Maryland) was away, but he would have voted for it if he had been present. Mr. Malins's desperate fighting dwindles to a very insignificant thing indeed when it is analysed.

Mr. Malins informs us that he was the author of an extra-judicial utterance which he gives and which he underlines on page 20 ; but it was impossible I could know that he had done this, for I know of no record where it is stated, and therefore I am not to blame for having made no reference to it. But what does the utterance amount to ? It is simply a declaration of what the law was, very much of the character of the latter part of Hastings's resolution, which he styles THE ROD. It



benefited no one, it effected no changes or reforms, nor did it even propose to do anything of the kind, and therefore it in no way invalidated the statement which I made as to their doing nothing at the London Session of the R.W.G.L. One thing it proves, viz., that Mr. Malins had a hand in reading and correcting the journals, and therefore is jointly responsible for its correctness.

On page 20, Mr. Malins quotes a passage from the Grand Lodge Constitution of North Carolina touching the Caucasian race, and he then says, *my foot-note appears to have had one result,—they struck this article out.* BUT WE HAVE SINCE LEARNED THEY DID NOT LET THE NEGRO IN.

The reader will presently peruse the history of the Boston Session, and he will then see that at that session Representative Ball, of North Carolina, moved a resolution asking for a duplicate Grand Lodge charter so that they might let the negroes in, but the motion was opposed by Mr. Malins and it was lost. If, therefore, Mr. Malins had written the “*real*” history of the above it would have read thus :—

*They struck this article out, and they wanted to let the negro in,* BUT WE WOULD NOT LET THEM.

This is worse than doing nothing, and I almost feel tempted to exclaim, following his example, “*May God forgive him.*”

At the top of page 22, Mr. Malins says :—

After reading the astounding statement that Judge Black’s motion was the only proposition that was made at that session to benefit the negro, I wrote Mr. Hoyle, asking him if he had read the authorities. He replied that he had done so three times.

The above extract is worked into the narrative so as to produce the impression that when Mr. Malins came to that point in reading my tract, he was struck with the remark quoted, and at once sat down and wrote to me as he says. The following correspondence will explain the matter, and show how different are the facts :—

November 24th, 1876.

Dear Mr. Hoyle,—I have read your first paper in the *Templar* on the negro question with interest, and desire to reply to it at Manchester, at our Special G.L. Session on Wednesday next. Would you oblige me as early as possible with early (rough) proofs of the concluding paper? If you would like to hear my reply, I think we could declare a recess in the afternoon, or work as a conference and admit you.

Yours truly,

William Hoyle, Esq.

JOSEPH MALINS.

November 25th, 1876.

Dear Mr. Malins,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your note, in which you ask for early rough proof of second part of my article in *Templar*, as you say you purpose replying to the whole article at the Grand Lodge Session, in Manchester, on Wednesday next. . . . The door of your Order has been closed against myself

and others because we cannot do violence to our convictions ; and if I enter your lodges it must not be by any special arrangement about a recess, but by the rescinding of the resolution which has barred us out.

I remain, yours truly,

WILLIAM HOYLE.

William Hoyle, Esq.

November 27th, 1876.

Dear Sir,—I thank you for your promise to send me early proof of article.

As to our barring you out, the passing or rescinding of our Executive resolutions cannot at all affect the *morale* of the situation. . . . . We simply apply the bar to keep out dishonest persons ; and they alone can be affected by it, since no honest opponent will pretend to give allegiance to both sides.

Very faithfully yours,

Wm. Hoyle, Esq.

JOSEPH MALINS.

November 28th, 1876.

Dear Mr. Malins,—Your note to hand. . . . . I cannot now reply to your note, further than to write and ask you whether you carefully read it over, especially the last sentence, which is as follows :—

“We simply apply the bar to keep out dishonest persons ; and they, and they alone, can be affected by it, since no honest opponent will pretend to give allegiance to both sides.”

I ask this question because I see that it is not your own handwriting, and I cannot but think that it has been hurriedly penned by your clerk.

I remain, very truly,

WILLIAM HOYLE.

William Hoyle, Esq.

December 7th, 1876.

My Dear Sir,—Your former letter miscarried, or I should have replied earlier. . . .

You ask whether I have carefully read the letter before signing it, and make this inquiry because you see it is not in my handwriting, and you cannot but think it has been hurriedly penned by a clerk. I beg to say in reply that I dictated every word in that letter, although I did not carefully read it afterwards for want of time.

And now I would take the liberty of asking you a somewhat similar question. . . .

I respectfully ask whether, when penning the article, you carefully read the documents quoted from ?

A reply as candid as my own will oblige.

Yours, very sincerely,

Wm. Hoyle, Esq.

JOSEPH MALINS.

I simply replied to the above that I had read them three times over.

I have given the above correspondence in order that the reader may see how different the real facts are from the ideas which Mr. Malins seeks to convey. The question was asked me, not when Mr. Malins read my statement, but fourteen days after, and it was put to me in a recriminating spirit, after receiving my question. It was not the remark in my tract that struck him, but it was the pointed question I put to him which nettled him, and in a fit of petulance he wrote to me.

At the close of the London Session Judge Black placed his notice of motion upon the book. It was signed, amongst others, by G. B. Thomas (Wales). It read as follows :—



To insert after the first sentence following the proviso of section 3 of article 6 of the R.W. Grand Lodge, the following :—After the assent obtained, or upon petition of any Grand Lodge, charters of one or more Grand Lodges, or for one or more subordinate lodges, under the immediate jurisdiction of the R.W.G. Lodges, may be granted, covering a part or the whole of the territory embraced by the charter of such existing Grand Lodges.

JAMES BLACK, Pennsylvania.  
 ELY T. MARSH, New York.  
 J. T. DOW, Wisconsin.  
 G. B. THOMAS, Wales.

In a letter written to Dr. Lees, dated November 15th, 1876, Judge Black says :—

It may be of some possible moment to correct the editorial statement in the "Line upon line" of the *Watchword* of October 18, when he says, the "amendment (Judge Black's) adopted at Bloomington was not adopted for the relief of the negro,"—"that it did ignore the colour question, and was so intended." I cannot understand the precise shade of meaning of the editor in using these words more than I know the precise feeling which moved representatives to adopt it at Bloomington on the report of a Southern man, and against the vehement opposition of Brother Malins, even to (when he could not have his way) taking off his regalia and quitting his seat ; but I do know the spirit and intent in which it was drafted and presented by me at Richmond Session in 1868 (see page 100), and called up at Oswego Session in 1869 (see pages 39 and 50), renewed at London Session in 1873 (see page 100), and again at Boston Session, 1874 (see page 112), and that was directly on the negro question, and for the relief of both blacks and whites. It was, however, prompted mainly by the desire to give the Order of Good Templars to the coloured people in the way they wanted, and in the only way in which they will have it, and that is, as an institution of their own, to be seen and enjoyed by themselves, and yet be equal in power and privileges with their white neighbours.

Mr. Malins several times objects that Judge Black's motion was not intended to relieve the negro, because it did not mention him. It would be as rational to say that a motion for universal suffrage was not intended to include household suffrage, because it did not name it.

### VIII.—THE BOSTON SESSION.

Mr. Malins heads his eighth chapter with the title, "*The Boston Skirmish*," and on reading it the reader will no doubt receive the impression that at Boston Mr. Malins and his friends had been doing battle for the negro. We shall see how far such a representation corresponds with the facts.

Mr. Malins opens the chapter by quoting Judge Black's motion, which came up at Boston. He makes much of the fact that Judge Black did not specifically say that it was intended to benefit the negro ; but then, so far as giving the power for the establishment of duplicate Grand Lodges, the thing was so plain that it needed no explanation.

And moreover, why should Judge Black raise up any hostility from the South by any statement that his motion was generally for the world, but specifically for them? Such a thing being needless, and likely to rouse ire, to have done it would have been folly.

Mr. Malins intimates more than once that Judge Black's motion was intended to split the Grand Lodge of England, but this statement as to his motive is absurd, for

1st. It was introduced in 1868, before there was any Grand Lodge of England; and

2nd. Judge Black's motion did not compel duplicate Grand Lodges in England or anywhere else, and could have no effect without the assent of existing Grand Lodges. It did not therefore do anything beyond empowering the English Grand Lodge to take action if it so chose, and surely it was absurd for the Grand Lodge of England to wish to have its hands tied behind it by any foreign authority.

When Judge Black's motion came up, Representative Bowen, of Wales, moved an amendment as substitute, which was lost, and Judge Black's motion was lost also. This took place on the third day of the session.

If the reader will examine the names affixed to the resolution offered by Judge Black, he will see the name of G. B. Thomas, of Wales. How comes it, then, that a Welsh representative moved an amendment to it? Perhaps it will throw a little light upon the matter when I state that a deputation from Wales, consisting of Messrs. Jones and Tilson, went to Liverpool, in 1874, to meet Mr. Malins, Mr. Capper, and Miss Armstrong, as they were on their way to the Boston Session, in order to urge upon them to support Judge Black's motion, as the Welsh representatives were instructed to do. Instead, however, of their lifting Mr. Malins up to his duty, he pulled them down, and before the motion came on, a compromise was arranged on the basis of language, and thus for another year help was refused to the negroes. And all owing to the opposition of Mr. Malins.

On the fourth day, Dr. Oronhyatekha moved to reconsider Representative Bowen's motion, which was agreed to. He then moved it, and Judge Black seconded it. Representative Ball, of North Carolina, moved an amendment to this amendment. It was as follows:—

That power be granted to establish an additional Grand Lodge either in Wales, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, or New Zealand.

This was lost, and the motion of Representative Bowen, re-introduced by Dr. Oronhyatekha, was carried.



In my pamphlet I condemned the action of the British in defeating Judge Black's motion by the amendment of Representative Bowen. Mr. Malins refers to this in his tract, and says :—

In thus writing, Mr. Hoyle, of course, ignores the fact that his esteemed friend Dr. O. was a main instrument in doing what he condemns us for supporting.

If the reader will take into consideration the whole of the circumstances of the case, I think he will say with me that the action, though it is to be condemned in the case of Mr. Malins, was highly praiseworthy on the part of the Doctor and the Judge, for they, first of all, tried to get the privilege of separate Grand Lodges to Wales, to the negroes in the Southern States, and to all others who might desire them, and when, owing to the opposition of the British, they could not get justice to the full, they said—Well, we will get what we can ; these *straight-laced* Englishmen will not go in for justice to all, therefore we must get justice for as many as we can. I say that it was very creditable to Judge Black and Dr. Oronhyatekha to do this, but it was not much to the credit of Mr. Malins and his friends, who make so much boast of being the champions of the negro ; for had Mr. Malins only supported and helped to carry Judge Black's motion, as the Welsh deputation wanted him to do, the negro difficulty would have been solved ere this, and we should have been spared all the mischief and strife resulting from the present calamitous description.

On page 26, Mr. Malins refers to Dr. Oronhyatekha, and says that his desire is to split the Grand Lodge of England. The Doctor informs me that this idea exists only in Mr. Malins's own imagination, that his desire is that the Grand Lodge shall do that which will best promote the good of the cause. But the statement of Mr. Malins is, on the face of it, absurd. He writes as if Judge Black's motion was a motion to compel the division of the Grand Lodge of England, whereas, all that it proposed to do was to enable the Grand Lodge to take such a step if, in the interests of the movement, it should be thought wise to do so. And why should this not be so ? Why should Mr. Malins be so madly anxious to tie the hands of the English Grand Lodge ? Is he afraid to trust them ? If so, let him not boast so loudly of their desire for one Grand Lodge. If they desire it, they will maintain it, but if they should see reason to change, the battle that it would be needful to fight before the change could be obtained would be so great that few would face it. There would first be to fight the battle to get delegates appointed who would advocate these views in R.W.G.L., and then it would have to be fought at home afterwards. Mr. Malins knew very

well, if he could keep the R.W.G.L. law as it was, it would effectually squelch any agitation in England, and keep his kingdom intact.

On the same page, referring again to Judge Black's motion, Mr. Malin says :—

Its adoption would have enabled the American Grand Lodges to indefinitely multiply themselves, "if they so desired."

But, except the State of New York, none of the Northern States desired division. The passing of the law would have led to far more Grand Lodges in the South, among the coloured population, than in the North. And why should a large and populous State like New York be prevented from dividing its unwieldy jurisdiction, simply because Mr. Malins is afraid of the example affecting England. This mania of Mr. Malins's has been a great block to the spread of the Order. And, strange to say, the imposture he has practised upon the Order to avert duplicate Grand Lodges has been the very means of securing the boon to this country.

On page 25, Mr. Malins refers to a meeting of the R.W.G.L. Executive which was held after the Boston Session. At that meeting he says that Colonel Hickman placed before them a copy of the True Reformers' Ritual, and asked him to endorse it. I have now lying before me a "true copy" of the minutes of that meeting, certified by Mr. Williams, the secretary, and there is not a word in it touching the incident to which Mr. Malins refers ; but I do find the following resolution in the said minutes :—

Moved by Brother Joseph Malins, seconded by Brother Vandoorn, and resolved, that the R.W.G. Templar give his special time and attention to promote the Order in those Southern States where there are no Grand Lodges, or where the Order is weak and wants assistance.

Mr. Malins says (page 23) that a later debate on the Order of True Reformers led him to seek an interview with the G.W.S. of North Carolina, and, from a conversation with him, the idea dawned upon his (Mr. Malins's) mind that it might be expedient to permit separate Grand Lodges for colour. He therefore, he says, drafted a notice to amend the R.W.G.L. Constitution by adding the words, "*or race*," after the word "*language*."

Now, the facts are as follows :—What little debate there was on the Order of True Reformers took place on the second day of the R.W.G. Lodge Session. (I have the MSS. notes of the debate now lying before me.) On the third day Judge Black's motion came on, and Representative Bowen's amendment (see R.W.G.L. journal, 1874, page



70), both of which were defeated. On the fourth day Dr. Oronhyatekha re-moved Representative Bowen's motion (see R.W.G.L. journal, page 89-90) when Representative Ball, of North Carolina, moved an amendment to the amendment granting power to establish duplicate Grand Lodges in New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, and New Zealand. This was defeated owing mainly to the opposition of the British. The question I wish to propose is, How was it that if, as Mr. Malins says, he got his eyes opened on the second day, he did not on the third and fourth days make use of the new light which dawned upon him to relieve the races, and to enfranchise the negroes? Why did he oppose Representative Ball's motion, or why did he not move his own alleged drafted motion as to race? This would have shown that he had got not only light, but a disposition to use it.

If the reader have got a copy of the Ultimatum sent out by Mr. Malins and his friends prior to their seceding, and will turn to page 4, he will find the following remarks touching the Boston Session :—

At this session a petition came from the coloured lodges in North Carolina, praying for a separate charter, and the white Grand Lodge endorsed the petition. The R.W.G.L., however, decided that, as no notice of motion on this subject had been given at the previous sessions, it would be a violation of duty to grant the petition.

A moment's consideration will make it clear that, under Judge Black's motion, which was placed in the journal of the R.W.G.L. at the London Session, and which came up at Boston, all motions touching the granting of dual charters, either to negroes or any other body, might have been introduced; and indeed, as I have shown, at the very session at which Mr. Malins says the R.W.G.L. refused to accept a motion on the alleged ground of insufficient notice, Representative Ball brought forward a motion granting what was asked for in the petition referred to, and Mr. Malins and his friends opposed and defeated it.

The records of the Boston Session prove that there were only two motions introduced at that session intended to afford any help to the negro, the first one was Judge Black's motion, and the second the motion of Representative Ball, of North Carolina, which sought to give duplicate Grand Lodges to North and South Carolina. Both were opposed by Mr. Malins, and the future historian of the Order will have to record the fact, that in the "BOSTON SKIRMISH" Mr. Malins was in the ranks of the enemy, fighting against justice to the negro.

At the close of the Boston Session Judge Black again placed his motion upon the books of the R.W.G.L., so as to enable him to bring it up at Bloomington.

## IX.—THE BLOOMINGTON SESSION.

We come now to the "BLOOMINGTON BATTLE" as Mr. Malins calls it. As we have seen, Judge Black gave notice of his motion at Boston again, and the Bloomington Session found it on the journals of the R.W.G.L. awaiting discussion. Dr. Wells Brown also had given a notice of motion, which was as follows:—

No more than one Grand Lodge shall be chartered in any State, district, or territory, except that after the assent obtained or upon the petition of any Grand Lodge, charters for one or more Grand Lodges may be granted when difference of language or race is found to be a barrier to the proper transaction of business.

The above resolution is vitally defective, as it contains no provision for the instituting of subordinate lodges, and it would have been impossible to have started a Grand Lodge until 10 subordinate lodges had been established. It was therefore practically useless. I have no wish to detract anything at all from whatever credit may belong to Mr. Malins touching what he did upon the negro question, but as the motion of Dr. Wells Brown is the only one Mr. Malins ever claims to have had anything to do with suggesting, I have thought it right to show what it amounts to.

But what was the action of the British in regard to this motion? Let us see!

Mr. Malins may probably be able to call to mind a meeting of the United Executives of Great Britain and Ireland, which was held in Edinburgh on the 2nd day of April, 1875. The object of the meeting was to review the propositions likely to come before the R.W.G.L., to be held at Bloomington in the following month of May. There were present the Rev. G. Gladstone, G.W.C.T.; John Sutherland, G.W.C.; Mrs. Parker, G.W.V.T.; W. W. Turnbull, G.W.S.; and Jas. Downie, G.W.T. of Scotland; Joseph Malins, G.W.C.T., England; Captain G. B. Thomas, G.W.T. of Wales (Welsh); W. L. Daniels, of Wales (English); also, Rev. John Kay, G.S.J.L.; and Mrs. Kirk and Robert Semple, members of the Grand Lodge of Scotland Juvenile Executive.

A copy of the minutes of the said Committee now lies before me. Amongst many other things which came up for consideration was the amendment of Judge Black, and also the two kindred motions referring to language and race. I copy them as they appear in the minutes.

(1) To so amend R.W.G.L. Constitution as to admit of more Grand Lodges than one in any jurisdiction where a difference of language necessitates it.



(2) To amend the above section as amended by inserting the words "or race" after the word "language."

(3) To amend by inserting "After the assent obtained or upon petition of any Grand Lodge, charters for one or more Grand Lodges or for one or more subordinate lodges under immediate jurisdiction of the R.W.G.L. may be granted, covering a part or the whole of the territory embraced by the charter of such existing Grand Lodge."

No. 1—APPROVED.

No. 2—LAID ON THE TABLE.

No. 3—NOT APPROVED.

Such were the guiding instructions given to the British representatives by the United Executives, whereby to shape their action when they arrived at Bloomington the succeeding month, and the reader will see that the recommendation as to Dr. Wells Brown's motion was, to lay it on the table.

The minutes of the above Committee cover 11 pages of printed matter, and the friend who sent them on to me writes as follows :—

Throughout the whole eleven pages of these minutes, the negro is but this once referred to, and not a syllable is there recorded at all calculated or intended to relieve this down-trodden race, a fact which cannot easily be reconciled with the position assumed at Louisville Session, and since sought to be maintained by these professed negro sympathisers.

Viewed from the stand-point of the Louisville action it would indeed be incredible—if it were not a fact—that Mr. Malins and his friends could wade through eleven pages of legislative proposals and never but once think of the negro, and then only to block or defeat such proposed legislation as would be likely to benefit him.

Well, the "BLOOMINGTON BATTLE" began. The notices of Judge Black and Dr. Wells Brown, which were placed upon the journals of the R.W.G.L. at the Boston Session, came up, and were referred to a committee, of which Judge Underwood was chairman. As I have shown, even in reference to the matter of race, Dr. Wells Brown's motion was vitally defective: and if it had passed it would have benefited nobody, and therefore no wonder that the Committee reported in favour of the motion of Judge Black, and the R.W.G.L. by a vote of 66 to 28 adopted the report; whereupon Messrs. Malins and Gladstone resigned their posts as officers of the R.W.G. Lodge, and only reassumed office again when the motion was agreed to be confined in its operation to Maryland and North Carolina. The resolution upon this subject was as follows :—

That the R.W.G.T. and R.W.G.S. be requested not to issue additional charters during the ensuing year to jurisdictions other than those of Maryland and North Carolina.

Following this resolution, which Mr. Malins reports on page 29, he proceeds to say :—

Having seemingly gained something for the negro, we resumed office; yet Mr. Hoyle insists that in opposing “Black’s amendment” we opposed the interests of the negro.

And Mr. Malins proceeds to speak of what they had done as being a concession wrung from the opponents of the negro.

Let me try to make clear this point by using an illustration.

I am a poor-law guardian in connection with the Bury Union, and I represent the township of Tottington, Lower End.

Supposing that when I attend the board on Wednesday, I find that the board decides to grant relief to 16 families in Tottington, as well as to a number of others outside Tottington. I object to this general granting of relief, but the board is firm. I resign my office unless the relief be withdrawn; at length, to secure my resumption of office, they consent to reduce the number of cases to be relieved to two. They do so, and I reassume office, and go about bragging what I have done for the poor of Tottington. I wonder what would be thought of such raving bluster! I fancy the impression would be that I had lost my wits. And yet this is the position taken up by Mr. Malins and his friends.

Let me apply the illustration.

The R.W.G. Lodge decided to grant such relief as will enable dual lodges to be formed in all the 16 Southern States, as well as in others, and thus give to the coloured people of the South a chance of entering the Order. Mr. Malins objected to the relief thus granted, and, along with Mr. Gladstone, resigned his office because of what had been done. To pacify these malcontents the R.W.G.L. restricted the relief granted to only two States out of the sixteen, and also excluding all the others from the benefit, whereupon they resume office, and then go about boasting what they have gained for the negro. One can hardly believe both in the sanity and sincerity of men who act and talk thus.

In a speech delivered at Teignmouth by Mr. Malins, September 7th, 1876, revised by himself, and published by the Grand Lodge of England, I find the following statement :—

We saw in that stroke (Judge Black’s motion) the death of our efforts for the negro. Our efforts in the past had been nullified by the excessive voting power that the Americans had; and if they were allowed to double their power, or to increase it at all, by multiplying Grand Lodges, it would make our task so much more difficult. They voted down our motion in favour of Negro Grand Lodges, and carried their motion, which simply aimed at multiplying White Grand Lodges, whereupon we resigned our offices. (See bottom of page 5.)



Now, touching these remarks, I wish to ask two or three questions :—

I. When had the British put forth any efforts for the negro, that either the Americans or anybody else had had a chance of nullifying ?

The only thing having a semblance of this was the writing out of Dr. Wells Brown's motion by Mr. Malins ; but as I have shown—

1st. That resolution was vitally defective, and therefore worthless ; it gave no help to the negroes.

2nd. The British voted that it should be laid upon the table.

3rd. Judge Black's motion contained all that was in Dr. Wells Brown's, and in addition, it had all the omitted parts that were needed to make it valuable.

II. When did the Americans, by their excessive voting power, obstruct or defeat a single proposal made by the British to benefit the negroes ? As I have shown, the British never made any such proposal, and therefore they could not have been nullified by the voting power of the Americans. The statement is simply a fabrication.

III. Did Judge Black's motion aim simply at multiplying White Grand Lodges ? Did not its provisions cover one race just as much as another ? It is a fact that it did—there were no exceptions—and therefore I say that the statement of Mr. Malins that it was “*simply aimed at multiplying White Grand Lodges*” is totally incorrect, and like the previous statement is a pure fabrication.

IV. Is it not a fact that during the whole of the debate preceding the resignation of their offices not a word was said about the negro, not a syllable ? It was all opposition to the multiplication of Grand Lodges, and they never attempted to make any motion to include the word race. In this respect they carried out the policy of their Edinburgh resolution. I have this upon the testimony of several persons who were present at the Bloomington Session.

That the allegations contained in the above are well founded is further proven by the subsequent action of Mr. Malins, for surely if there had been that desire to aid the negroes which his present contention indicates, there would have been some sort of effort made to do

this. One would have expected that they would have moved a resolution somewhat as follows :—

Nevertheless, in the case where any Grand Lodge neglects or refuses to mission any portion of the population under its jurisdiction, it shall be lawful for the R.W.G.L., upon giving twelve months' notice to such G.L., to consider the said population as residing in unoccupied territory, and to make such arrangements for missioning the same as may seem to it the most appropriate.

Action of this kind would have had some practical purpose. Why was it not taken? As I said in my tract, page 8, “How comes it that “there was all this concern for the negro, and yet, prior to their ultimatum, they offer no motion to help him? for it is a fact which is “attested by the records of the R.W.G.L. that the British representatives never made any proposition at all calculated—or so far as I can “see intended—to solve the negro difficulty. Possibly they may have “made speeches dilating upon the question, but words of themselves “are mere wind. To accomplish reforms, actions are needed. I ask, “What proposition did they submit, or what action did they take to “help the negro before sending out their ultimatum? The answer is, “none! none whatever!!”

Since the Louisville Session and the secession, Mr. Malins has laboured hard to show that his motion meant more than its phraseology implies, that it was intended to open up the whole question. Well, if it was, it was certainly a singular way of showing it; but how do these declarations tally with Mr. Malins's own expressed ideas as to what his purpose was, for Mr. Malins had written letters to Maryland stating that if the coloured people wanted a Grand Lodge they had better get it instituted at once, or they would lose their chance. This fact is stated in a letter to the G.W.C.T. of Maryland by the two gentlemen who were the representatives for Maryland at the Louisville Session of the R.W.G.L. I give the passage from the letter referred to :—

We have been notified in Maryland, by letters from Joseph Malins, G.W.C.T. of England, that if the coloured people of Maryland wanted a G.L., they had better get it instituted before the session of the R.W.G.L. at Louisville, as the power to have duplicate Grand Lodges would be rescinded before the notice which they had constitutionally given, and upon which the Maryland representatives went to Louisville prepared to vote. Nay, but those brethren who had given notice as above stated thought proper to ignore it, and introduce another question which Brother Malins had acknowledged would without doubt cause a rupture in the R.W.G.L., and asked at a meeting at the Howard House, in Baltimore City, if he could not depend upon Maryland sustaining him, as he was sure they—the English, Welsh, and Scotch—would withdraw.

Respectfully submitted in Faith, Hope, and Charity,

A. D. EVANS,

W. M. FERGUSON,

June 12th, 1876.

Representatives to the R.W.G.L. from Maryland.



The above communication, which is quite in harmony with the genius of the notice of motion given by Mr. Malins, shows clearly what his intentions were in proposing it. If it had been intended to help the negroes, it could hardly have been farther from the mark.

The statement in the above extract intimating their intention to secede is corroborated by Mr. Malins himself, who, in his address at Teignmouth, previously quoted from, says (see page 9) :—

Well, we withdrew. We intended, if need be, when we left England to secede ; and if you notice the first telegrams that came over said we had SECEDED. They were thus imperfectly worded, because the news was sent in cypher, indicating paragraphs previously drawn up.

The secret preparation made for secession before leaving England is shown in the fact of the publication of the statement of the case with the report of the secession immediately upon the event taking place. For instance, the British representatives left the R.W.G. Lodge on Thursday, the 25th of May, 1876 ; during the course of the following week an extended statement appears in several English papers—a statement which must have been drawn up prior to the departure of the representatives to America, showing that the preparations for secession had been fully made, that the plot had been skilfully laid, and that all the arrangements that were needed had been made beforehand so as to secure the success of the plot which had been designed. The seceders had even gone so far as to ask a reverend clergyman of the Church of England to adapt the ritual to the future changed position, but he declined, and it is said that the task fell into the hands of a Reverend gentleman in the south of England.

## X.—THE LOUISVILLE SESSION & UNCONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.

And now I come to the R.W.G.L. Session at Louisville. As I said in my tract, Mr. Malins did not move the amendment of which he had given notice ; he got Representative Dennis, from Nova Scotia, to do this, and then Mr. Gladstone moved his resolution as an amendment to that amendment.

Mr. Malins asserts that my statement that the amendment was out of order would have had more weight if it had come from someone *experienced in Good Templar law*, as if, forsooth, it needed a knowledge of Good Templar law to decide whether an amendment to a notice of motion was in order or not.

But this is a point of very small importance. The question as to what is proper to introduce in an amendment upon a notice of motion needs not a genius either in experience or intellect to decide it. The rule is very simple and plain. It is this—*that it must be an amendment touching the principle of the notice of motion*. In the illustration which Mr. Malins gives touching the G. Chaplain, &c., the principle of the motion is the enlarging of the Executive, and his moving the addition of the General Superintendent of Juvenile Templars is quite in harmony with it.

The principle underlying Judge Black's amendment was the giving of power for the multiplication of Grand Lodges; and, therefore, the motion of Dr. Oronhyatekha referred to by Mr. Malins, which proposed to restrict it to places where difficulties of language demanded it, was quite in keeping with its spirit. It simply specified that the law should not be made general, but should be restricted to those occasions where difficulties of language necessitated it.

Now what was Mr. Malins's notice of motion, and what was his amendment? Let us compare them.

The motion, of which he gave notice at Bloomington, was as follows:

We give notice to rescind the alteration made at this session referring to the multiplication of Grand Lodges.

JOSEPH MALINS.

The amendment which was offered by Mr. Gladstone reads as follows:

To strike out from the R.W.G. Lodge Constitution, article 1, sec. 3, the words commencing with "except" and ending with "business," and insert the following in their place: "Except that in any Grand Lodge territory where differences of language or race preclude united working, a duplicate Grand Lodge charter may be granted, covering the same territory, and having jurisdiction over all subordinate lodges of the language or race for which it is granted; *and in any case where a Grand Lodge excludes persons from membership, owing to language or race, its jurisdiction shall, so far as the excluded community is concerned, be considered unoccupied territory, and the R.W.G. Lodge, OR ANY GRAND LODGE, may mission such portions till they have sufficient subordinate lodges to receive a duplicate Grand Lodge charter, with co-equal powers with the senior Grand Lodge in that territory.*

Now if the reader will note Mr. Malins's argument, and the illustration which he gives, he will see that it only touches the first half of the above resolution; the second half, which is given in *italics*, he entirely ignores. His method of proving his case is very much on the principle of the man who went to the Bible to prove there was no God. He found the passage, "there is no God," but he left out the first part of the passage, "*The fool hath said in his heart.*" Mr. Malins's logic is



exactly on a par with the above, excepting that he leaves out the second part instead of the first. What may not a man prove when he resorts to such manœuvres?

If the reader examines carefully the notice of motion given by Mr. Malins at Bloomington, he will see that it contains but one principle, viz., the multiplication of Grand Lodges; but if the reader examines the amendment proposed by Mr. Gladstone, he will see that there are four points of principle affected by it:—

1. The granting of duplicate Grand Lodge charters is to be confined to territories where differences of language or race preclude united workings.
2. Where Grand Lodges exclude persons on account of language or race, such persons to be considered as unoccupied territory.
3. That any Grand Lodge choosing to mission such persons may do so, thus giving one Grand Lodge power to invade the territory and authority of another.
4. That this may be done with or without the concurrence of the R.W.G. Lodge.

Now Mr. Malins only deals with the first of these four points, and nobody ever dreamt of saying that had Mr. Gladstone's amendment been confined to that point it would not have been perfectly constitutional. But in that case it ought to have read something as follows:—

That the notice of motion touching the multiplication of Grand Lodges be rescinded, except in so far as it relates to territories where differences of language or race preclude united working.

This would have been perfectly constitutional, and it is the only point of the resolution which Mr. Malins deals with. Why does he, in the contrast which he gives, omit the other points in Mr. Gladstone's resolution? As he has done this, I must supply the omission.

WHAT MR. MALINS'S NOTICE OF MOTION  
PROPOSED.

To rescind the motion of Judge Black, which gave to all territories power to have duplicate Grand Lodges.

WHAT MR. GLADSTONE'S AMENDMENT  
THERE TO PROPOSED.

1. To except from the rescinding of Judge Black's motion all territories where difference of language or race precluded united working.
2. To declare certain portions of existing Grand Lodge jurisdictions unoccupied territory.
3. To authorise any Grand Lodge to invade the territory of other Grand Lodges, if it only raised the plea that certain portions were not occupied.
4. To give this power to Grand Lodges irrespective of the will of the supreme head—the R.W.G. Lodge.

The first of the four points in the amendment was perfectly in order, as it bore upon the principle of the notice of motion; but the other three points were entirely out of order, as they introduced issues which were not in the notice of motion.

MORAL.—Mr. Hoyle does not find fault with Mr. Gladstone for looking over the hedge, but for proposing to break through the fence and steal three-fourths of the cattle. I say steal, because three-fourths of the points in the proposed amendment were irrelevant to the resolution, and therefore it was a surreptitious way of trying to get them.

One of the first actions they did after they seceded, and met in the Masonic Hall at Louisville, was, to recognise the difficulties of the situation as to the colour question, and to make special provision for separate lodges for the negro race. There has been a widespread belief among the membership in England, which has been fostered by Mr. Malins, that their programme was to insist upon the whites throwing open their lodges to the coloured people. They did nothing of the sort. They found this to be impossible, and hence they accommodated themselves to the necessities of the case by arranging for separate lodges for the negroes ; but, in doing this, they conceded the whole thing ; for, if the principle of concession be admitted, it becomes a question purely of circumstances as to the degree and mode of concession to be made.

### THE HIDDEN HISTORY—THE WATCHDOG, &c.

I will only briefly refer to the remainder of Mr. Malins's tract. I do this for the simple reason that if it were true it would not materially affect the question.

It has never been denied that some of the Southern Grand Lodges have not acted in an exclusive spirit towards the negro—this has been the ground of complaint ; and the whole discussion has been, or ought to have been—How is the evil to be remedied ? and therefore the indictment which Mr. Malins now makes, is wholly beside the present question.

And let it not here be understood that I admit the truth of all his allegations. I do no such thing. I have too vivid a recollection of the Kentucky charge, the Florida case, and the charges previously made against the Hon. S. D. Hastings and Mr. Secretary Williams. These charges were trumpeted forth with a vigour and a persistency truly extraordinary, but they have been proven to be untrue ; and I venture to say that when we know the whole facts of the case alluded to by Mr. Malins, they will wear a very different aspect from what they do under his artistic colouring.

Mr. Malins heads his thirteenth chapter with the title—THE WATCH-



DOG AND HIS TRUST ; and as I had myself applied the epithet to him as R.W.G. Counsellor, and charged him with a dereliction of duty, I was naturally curious to see what he had to say in defence of himself ; but when I come to read it, I find defence is not attempted. I suppose he feels that it is not possible, and therefore coolly passes over this chapter in his own history during 1874 and 1875, and goes back to 1872 and 1873, when Colonel Hickman was R.W.G. Counsellor, and makes an attack upon him. It would only have been becoming, before attacking anyone else, if he had first of all cleared himself.

In my pamphlet, page 16, I charged Mr. Malins with having been on the Executive of the R.W.G. Lodge, as R.W.G. Counsellor—the watchdog of the Order—for the two years prior to the secession, and I said that during that time he never once made a complaint to his brother officials that the laws of the Order were being violated ; he never found fault with them for any dereliction of duty ; he never brought forward any proposal calculated to remedy the evils which, in some parts, had an existence ; and these charges of mine he makes no attempt to reply to or explain, but silently leaps over this part of his history, and, as I have said, attacks Colonel Hickman, who was R.W.G. Counsellor the two years previous.

At the conference which was held in London during the autumn of last year, Colonel Hickman referred to his former experience, and acknowledged that four years ago his views were not then what they are now. He alleged that his education had been very different to ours, and he pleaded that there should be some consideration shown, owing to the defects of his early training. As I have stated, he acknowledged that he did not then see things as he sees them now, and, as matter of course, his actions were not so thorough as they would be to-day.

Now, in the case of Mr. Malins this could not be so, for he boasts that seven years ago he wrote : “ *We are the champions of Humanity.* ” He was the “ *Watchdog* ” par excellence, and if Colonel Hickman did not fully know his duty, Mr. Malins did ; but did he do it ? No. During the two years when he was “ *Watchdog* ” he never once barked. Did I say never once ? I am wrong ; he did ! He barked at Judge Black and at Representative Ball at Boston ; and at Bloomington he again barked so loudly at Judge Black, and became so furious, that he broke out of his collar and ran loose !! And all this was because Judge Black wanted to include the negroes, and all the world besides. And yet he writes : “ *We are the champions of humanity.* ” He should have said : “ *We are the champions of exclusion.* ”

The action of R.W.G. Templar Hastings in replying to Col. Hickman, referred to by Mr. Malins on page 54 of his tract, shows clearly what were his views of the authority of the R.W.G.L. and of Grand Lodges. He says :—

The matter of granting or refusing to grant charters to applicants within the jurisdiction of a Grand Lodge is a matter entirely under the control of the Grand Lodge and its officers, and the action of the Grand Lodge in such cases is not a matter of review by the R.W.G. Templar or the R.W.G.L., and should an appeal come to me in a case of this kind I should dismiss it for want of jurisdiction.

When the action of the R.W.G.L. or of R.W.G. Templar Hastings is judged from this point of view, which is the one which he clearly held, it is perfectly explicable ; and, indeed, it is difficult to see what other course could have been pursued. But then it may be asked, why did not the R.W.G.L. try to get the Constitution amended so as to enable it to deal with shortcoming Grand Lodges ? My answer to this is, they did try. Judge Black's amendment, which he introduced five times over between 1868 and 1875, was the first and the main step to secure this, for without this it was impossible to give to the coloured people a Grand Lodge, and as they would not meet together in the same lodges their admission into the Order was impossible. But who were the great opponents of that measure ? They were the British. And, therefore, they were far more to blame in this matter than the Americans. And for those who were the great blocks to the needed reform to throw stones at the R.W.G.L. is not only inconsistent but unjust.

And now let the reader look at the situation. A few men—some of them, no doubt, misled—meet together. They set forth to the world that in connection with the Order with which they are associated the negro is excluded. They tell us that they have been struggling for years to remedy the evil, and that their efforts have been foiled ; and that, owing to recent legislation in the R.W.G. Lodge (Judge Black's amendment), they see the death of all their efforts for the negro. And sooner than be in connection with an Order which refuses to acknowledge the rights of man, and which excludes the negro, they secede. They tell their story to the members of the Order, who believe what they say, and endorse their subsequent action. These mis-statements are followed by a host of slanderous statements as baseless as their other facts are, of which the annexed foot-note is an example.\*

---

\* Mr. Hoyle, P.G.W.T.

October 9th, 1876.

My dear Sir and Brother,—Your favour to hand. We make no actual conditions. If Colonel Hickman seeks an interview he can have it. I expect he knows that. He never was denied in Louisville, but had several interviews with us after the separation.